

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **November 28, 2003**, the examiner reviewed claims 1-21. Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiner (USPub 2002/0157062, hereinafter “Greiner”) in view of Rodriguez (USPub 2002/0087921, hereinafter “Rodriguez”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiner in view of Rodriguez. Applicant respectfully points out that Greiner teaches splitting the data bits into groups, generating a parity bit for the group, and transmitting the group, including the parity bit, **at the same time** (see Greiner, paragraph [0115]).

In contrast, the present invention splits the data bits into groups, generates an error code for the group, and transmits the group, including the error code, wherein each data bit and the error code are transmitted **at different times** (see FIGs. 3B-3C and page 8, line 5 to page 9, line 10 of the instant application). Transmitting each data bit and the error code at different times is advantageous because it associates each bit with a different clock pulse and thus allows detection, and possibly correction, of errors even when the errors are caused by the clock signal being faulty. There is nothing within Greiner or Rodriguez, either separately or in concert, which would suggest transmitting each data bit and the error code at different times.

Accordingly Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to include the limitations of dependent claims 2 and 5, 9 and 12, and 16 and 19, respectively, to clarify that the present invention claims generating an error code for the group, and transmitting the group, including the error code, wherein each data bit and the error code are transmitted at different times. These amendments find support in FIGs. 3B-3C and on page 8, line 5 to page 9, line 10 of the instant

application. Claims 2, 5, 9, 12, 16, and 19 have been canceled without prejudice. Dependent claims 3-4, 6-7, 10-11, 13-14, 17-18, and 20-21 have been amended to correct antecedent basis.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 8, and 15 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-4 and 6-7, which depend upon claim 1, claims 10-11 and 13-14, which depend upon claim 8, and claims 17-18 and 20-21, which depend upon claim 15 are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By


Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: December 22, 2003

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665